



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,322	10/23/2003	Leonardo E. Blanco	305624.01	8609
69316 7590 04/10/2009 MICROSOFT CORPORATION ONE MICROSOFT WAY REDMOND, WA 98052				
EXAMINER AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS				
ART UNIT 2179		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 04/10/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DBOUTON@MICROSOFT.COM

vfiling@microsoft.com

stevensp@microsoft.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/692,322

Applicant(s)

BLANCO ET AL.

Examiner

NICHOLAS AUGUSTINE

Art Unit

2179

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 17-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 17-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

- A. This action is in response to the following communications: Amendment filed: 2/2/2009. This action is made **Final**.
- B. Claims 1-8 and 17-26 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-8 and 17-26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bahrs (US 6,901,554 B1), herein referred to as "Bahrs".

As for independent claim 1, Bahrs teaches a computer-executable method, comprising: arranging a parent window to contain a plurality of child windows (col.22,lines 44-63; an application (parent) is made up of a plurality of components (children) in a hierarchical structure); providing via the arranging enhanced functionality available to the parent

window through a media integration layer (MIL) component to one or more legacy windows of the contained plurality of child windows that do not natively support the enhanced functionality by, for each of the plurality of child windows (col.27,lines 45-60; col.34, lines 32-38; system is able to be used for legacy systems and all of its components that make up the legacy interface to upgrade the functionality): determining if a the child window of a the parent window is a legacy window that does not natively support the enhanced functionality or is an MIL-aware window that natively supports the enhanced functionality when the child window is a legacy window: calling a legacy display component to perform rendering to output the child window; (col.14,lines 24-65 and col.17, lines 55-57);causing the child window output from the legacy display component to be redirected to an off-screen buffer; retrieving the child window output from the off-screen buffer (col.60, lines 38-57); and applying a visual enhancement to the child window output through the enhanced functionality available to the parent window through the MIL component (col.14,lines 24-65 and col.17, lines 30-57); and when the child window is an MIL-aware window, rendering the child window directly through the MIL component; and composing a visual representation of the parent window having the visually enhanced child window output corresponding to each child window determined to be a legacy window (col.35, line 45 - col.36, line 16 and 66-67; col. 37, lines 1-22; col.14,lines 24-65 and col.17, lines 55-57; col.27,lines 45-60; col.34, lines 32-38). Bahrs describes a system which is able to take legacy system interface (along with other such as different platforms) and upgrade them to have enhanced functionality (additional logic, added controls, etc...). Bahrs teaches the same

functionality as the immediate claim language but does not have the exact terms the immediate claim language has (e.g. Media Integration Layer); however as the terms are described in the specification and claim language of the immediate application it is shown that at least in the summary portions cited by Bahrs that it is in fact that Bahrs teaches the same functionality of the immediate application (col.2, line 54; col.15, line 25).

As for dependent claim 2, Bahrs teaches the method recited in claim 1, wherein the legacy window is configured to be administered by a legacy display component having fewer visual enhancements than a Media Integration Layer (MIL) component (col.27, lines 45-60; col.23, lines 30-52).

As for dependent claim 3, Bahrs teaches the method recited in claim 2, wherein causing the child window output to be redirected comprises instructing the legacy display component to redirect the child window output to the off-screen buffer (col.60, lines 38-57).

As for dependent claim 4, Bahrs teaches the method recited in claim 3, wherein the legacy display component comprises a user subcomponent and a Graphics Device Interface subcomponent (col.23, lines 4-19).

As for dependent claim 5, Bahrs teaches the method recited in claim 1, wherein the visual enhancement comprises a selected one or more from a group comprising re-sizing, re-shaping, relocating window component output, applying transparency, rotating and translating window component output, and applying a texture or visual effect to the window component output (col.24, lines 13-35).

As for dependent claim 6, Bahrs teaches the method recited in claim 1, wherein the visual enhancement comprises scaling the child window output to reflect a different screen resolution than originally applicable (col.24, lines 13-35).

As for dependent claim 7, Bahrs teaches the method recited in claim 2 4-, wherein composing the visual representation of the parent window is performed by the MIL component (col.14, lines 24-65; col.17, lines 55-57; col.20, lines 27-33).

As for independent claim 8, Bahrs teaches *a computer-readable medium having, stored thereon, computer-executable instructions which, when executed, direct a computer to arrange a parent window to contain a plurality of child windows;*
provide via the arranging enhanced functionality available to the parent window through a media integration layer (MIL) component (visual bit used in the win management component to change the style of the window) to one or more legacy windows of the contained plurality of child windows that do not natively support the enhanced

functionality by, for each of the plurality of child windows (col.22,lines 44-63); determine if a the child window of a the parent window is a legacy window that does not natively support the enhanced functionality or is an MIL-aware window that natively supports the enhanced functionality when the child window is a legacy window: call a legacy window; display component including a user component and a Graphics Display Interface component to perform rendering to output the chi (col.27, ,lines 45-60; col.20, lines 27-33);cause the child window output to be redirected to an off-screen buffer; retrieve the child window output from the off-screen buffer (col.60, lines 38-57); and apply a visual enhancement to the child window output through the enhanced functionality available to the parent window through the MIL component (col.14,lines 24-65; col.17, lines 55-57); and when the child window is an MIL-aware window, rendering the child window directly through the MIL component; and composing a visual representation of the parent window having the visually enhanced child window output corresponding to each child window determined to be a legacy window (col.35, line 45 - col.36, line 16 and 66-67; col. 37, lines 1-22; col.14,lines 24-65 and col.17, lines 55-57; col.27,lines 45-60; col.34, lines 32-38). Bahrs describes a system which is able to take legacy system interface (along with other such as different platforms) and upgrade them to have enhanced functionality (additional logic, added controls, etc...). Bahrs teaches the same functionality as the immediate claim language but does not have the exact terms the immediate claim language has (e.g. Media Integration Layer); however as the terms are described in the specification and claim language of the immediate application it is shown that at least in the summary portions cited by Bahrs that it is in

fact that Bahrs teaches the same functionality of the immediate application (col.2, line 54; col.15, line 25).

As for independent claim 17, Bahrs teaches an apparatus comprising:."

a processor; and memory storing components executable via the processor~ the components including: a user component configured to invoke a media integration layer (MIL) component to directly render a parent window and one or more child windows of the parent window that are MIL-aware and create an off-screen buffer upon detecting the presence of a legacy child window of a parent window; a GDI component configured to redirect window output from the legacy child window to the off-screen buffer upon being notified by the user component of the existence of the legacy child window; and a MIL component configured to retrieve the redirected window output from the off-screen buffer and apply a visual enhancement to the redirected window output in connection with composing the parent window for display on a display device and to directly render the one or more child windows of the parent window that are MIL-aware, wherein the parent window is configured to: contain a plurality of child windows; support enhanced functionality available through the MIL component; and enable the enhanced functionality available through the MIL component to visually enhance one or more legacy child windows of the contained plurality of child windows that do not natively support the enhanced functionality of the MIL component (note the analysis of claim 1 above and (col.35, line 45 - col.36, line 16 and 66-67; col. 37, lines 1-22; col.14,lines 24-65 and col.17, lines 55-57; col.27,lines 45-60; col.34, lines 32-38). Bahrs describes a

system which is able to take legacy system interface (along with other such as different platforms) and upgrade them to have enhanced functionality (additional logic, added controls, etc...). Bahrs teaches the same functionality as the immediate claim language but does not have the exact terms the immediate claim language has (e.g. Media Integration Layer); however as the terms are described in the specification and claim language of the immediate application it is shown that at least in the summary portions cited by Bahrs that it is in fact that Bahrs teaches the same functionality of the immediate application (col.2, line 54; col.15, line 25).

As for dependent claim 18, Bahrs teaches the apparatus computer executable medium recited in claim 17, wherein the user component maintains data structures that describe a layout and position of the legacy child window and its legacy children (col.24, lines 13-27).

As for dependent claim 19, Bahrs teaches the apparatus computer executable medium recited in claim 17, wherein the MIL component maintains data structures that describe a layout and position of the parent window and its children (col.23, lines 4-34; col.24, lines 13-27).

As for dependent claim 20, Bahrs teaches the apparatus computer executable medium recited in claim 19, wherein the visual enhancement is at least one of a plurality of visual enhancements comprising re-sizing, re-shaping, relocating window

component output, applying transparency, rotating and translating window component output, applying a texture or visual effect to the window component output, and scaling the legacy child window output to reflect a different screen resolution than originally applicable (col.23, line 4 – col.24, line 27).

As for dependent claim 21, Bahrs teaches the apparatus computer executable medium recited in claim 17, wherein the MIL component is further configured to interact with the user component and the GDI component to identify a location on a child window of the parent window corresponding to a location of an input event (col.14, lines 24-65; col.17, lines 55-57; col.20, lines 27-33).

As for independent claim 22, Bahrs teaches *a computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions stored thereon that when executed direct a computer to perform acts comprising: determining whether a child window of a parent window is a legacy window that does not natively support enhanced functionality available to the parent window through a media integration layer (MIL) component, or is an MIL-aware window that natively supports the enhanced functionality; responsive to determining that the child window is an MIL-aware window, rendering the child window directly via the MIL component; responsive to determining that the child window is a legacy window that does not natively support enhanced functionality: calling a legacy display component to perform rendering of the child window; redirecting the rendering of the child window of a parent window to an off-screen buffer responsive to determining that*

the child window is a legacy window that does not natively support enhanced functionality, wherein the parent window does natively support the enhanced functionality; issuing instructions to notify the parent window that the redirected child window is being or has been set up; retrieving the redirected child window from the off-screen buffer; and applying a visual enhancement to the redirected child window through the enhanced functionality available to the parent window from the MIL component (note the analysis of claim 1 above and (col.35, line 45 - col.36, line 16 and 66-67; col. 37, lines 1-22; col.14,lines 24-65 and col.17, lines 55-57; col.27,lines 45-60; col.34, lines 32-38). Bahrs describes a system which is able to take legacy system interface (along with other such as different platforms) and upgrade them to have enhanced functionality (additional logic, added controls, etc...). Bahrs teaches the same functionality as the immediate claim language but does not have the exact terms the immediate claim language has (e.g. Media Integration Layer); however as the terms are described in the specification and claim language of the immediate application it is shown that at least in the summary portions cited by Bahrs that it is in fact that Bahrs teaches the same functionality of the immediate application (col.2, line 54; col.15, line 25).).

As for dependent claim 23, Bahrs teaches the computer-readable medium recited in claim 22, wherein the instructions to notify the parent comprises a window message indicating that the redirected child window is being created (col.23, lines 4-52).

As for dependent claim 24, Bahrs teaches the computer-readable medium recited in claim 23, wherein the window message includes a window handle to the redirected child window (col.19, lines 13-42; col.23, lines 30-52).

As for dependent claim 25, Bahrs teaches the computer-readable medium recited in claim 22, wherein the instructions to notify the parent comprises a window message indicating that the redirected child window is about to be shown (col.22, lines 29-63).

As for dependent claim 26, Bahrs teaches the computer-readable medium recited in claim 25, wherein the window message includes a window handle to the redirected child window (col.19, lines 13-57).

(Note :) It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 and 17-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056 and fax is 571-270-2056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 9:30am- 5:00pm Eastern.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Steven B Theriault/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179

/Nicholas Augustine/
Examiner
Art Unit 2179
April 3, 2009